

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	WT Docket No. 04-140
)	
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Rules)	
Governing the Amateur Radio Services)	

REPLY TO COMMENTS

Comment Date: April 26, 2004

Adam Lassiter, and un-named others, have said (through him) that they are against extending amateur experimentation of spread spectrum into new bands. They say:

a. *"Two meters is crowded as it is and spread spectrum would make this problem worse."*

Current regulations prohibit amateurs from interfering with others. 97.101(a)(b)(c)(d). The spectrum is crowded because the technology used is over 70 years old.

b. *"It would cause havoc to the many repeater systems with input frequencies placed throughout the band."*

In addition to my response above, I would like to say that there are technical means that are used in both direct sequence and frequency hopping systems, which would allow both emission types to co-exist and not cause undesired interference.

c. *"The rest of the band is well used with packet, weak signal, satellite and simplex."*

This comment, in effect, says there is no room left for experimentation, and only proven utility modes may use the allocation. This is clearly in violation of the expectations of the commission regarding 97.1(b).

d. *"It is often difficult to find a clear simplex frequency, and I can see no room for spread spectrum experimentation where it will not interfere with current modes of communications on 2 meters."*

This is a very negative statement, and one that is not shared by those who want to experiment with new technology. I would like the commission to error on the side of experimentation, and not restrict us to one or two legacy emission modes.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven R. Sampson, K5OKC
5600 SE 83rd St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73135